

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Status of Claims**

Prior to entry of this paper, Claims 1-44 were pending. Claims 1-44 were rejected. In this paper, Claims 1, 21, 29, and 41 are amended. Claims 1-44 remain pending. No new matter is added by way of this amendment. For at least the following reasons, it is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance.

### **II. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C § 102**

**Claims 1-2, 6-8, 10-12, 18-22, 26-28, 30-32, 38-41 and 44** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated over Bhattacharya "Design Notes on Asynchronous I/O (aio) for Linux" (hereafter Bhattacharya).

**Claim 1** has been amended to include the limitation of changing the priorities of the requests in the request queue based on the number of events available at the event port, wherein the changing is further based on a specified number of events to be retrieved as part of at least one request received in response to the number of events available at the event port. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, on page 5, lines 6-18 of the specification as originally filed.

This amendment clarifies the distinction and thus patentability between the claimed invention and the cited prior art. Specifically, these amendments clarify the priority of the event retrieval requests and the manner in which this priority may be modified by the claimed invention

With regards to the amended limitations of Claim 1 and the previously cited teachings of Bhattacharya, it is respectfully submitted that the Bhattacharya does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the claimed invention. Specifically, Bhattacharya does not teach or suggest (A) ordering the request queue based on priorities of the requests in the request queue and (B) changing the priorities of the requests in the request queue based on a number of events available at a completion port, wherein the changing is further based on a specified number of events to be retrieved as part of a request received in response to the number of available events.

Regardless, none of these sections discuss ‘ordering’ the items in a queue based on priorities, as is claimed in amended Claim 1. In contrast, the cited sections suggest ‘separate queues for different priorities’ and building “an aggregate queue (virtual) queue” (section 5, page 10). Separate queues are not equivalent or suggestive of “a request queue” that has been ordered based on priorities of the requests queued therein. A virtual queue is also not the same as the claimed



such desirability or suggestion been cited in the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established for at least Claim 4. Further, as it relates to Claim 1, these teachings of Bhattacharya cannot be implemented to arrive at the priority-related arrangement of amended Claim 1, since they do not include or suggest a basis for changing priorities that at least comprises the specified number of events in a request received from the computer software application and a number of available events. Again, as noted above, the priorities discussed in Bhattacharya do not include particular priorities for retrieval operations, which are an underlying feature of the claimed invention.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Bhattacharya does not teach all of the limitations of Claim 1, including the amended limitation, as currently claimed.

It is respectfully submitted that none of the other references cure these deficiencies. Benhase deals with priorities for IO operations, again, which does not particularly teach or suggest 'retrieval priorities' as are the subject of the claimed invention (col. 1, lines 15-19). Regardless, the requests in Benhase does not involve multiple event for a single return and the IO requests. The only disclosed form of priority adjustment is based on the priority of a second entry (col. 3, lines 6-9). This is distinct from changing priorities based on a specified number of events to retrieve as part of a retrieval request, wherein this request is received in response to the number of available events. For at least these reasons, Benhase do not anticipate nor render obvious the limitations of Claim 1, as amended.

Lucovsky, similar to Bhattacharya, also utilizes also utilizes LIFO queue for ordering waiting requests (col. 10, lines 50-54). For at least the reasons similar to those listed above, Lucovsky cannot be considered to teach the claimed "priorities" or the "ordering" of the request queue based on priorities as is presently claimed. It is further noted that Lucovsky also does not involve returning multiple events with a single thread. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Lucovsky does not teach or suggest changing priorities at least based on the specified number of events included in a retrieval request as has been included in the amended limitations of Claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that none of the prior art relied upon in the rejections in the previous Office Action, whether alone or collectively considered, teaches or suggests all of these limitations of amended Claim 1, particularly when these limitations

are considered as a whole. As such, withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

So far as **Claims 2, 6-8, 10-12, 18-22, 26-28, 30-32, 38-41 and 44** depend from Claim 1 or have been amended to include similar limitations, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons listed above. In light of the above remarks, withdrawal of the rejections of each of these claims is respectfully requested.

### **III. Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C § 103**

**Claims 4, 5, 9, 24, 25, 29, 33, 35, 37 and 43** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhattacharya.

So far as **Claims 4, 5, 9, 24, 25, 29, 33, 35, 37 and 43** depend from amended Claims 1, 21, and 41, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons listed above. It is also noted that Claim 29 has been amended herein in order to clarify the proper dependency for the claim. In light of the above remarks, withdrawal of the rejections of each of these claims is respectfully requested.

**Claims 3, 23 and 42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhattacharya in view of Benhase et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,745,262 (hereafter Benhase).

So far as **Claims 3, 23 and 42** depend from amended Claims 1, 21, and 41, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons listed above. In light of the above remarks, withdrawal of the rejections of each of these claims is respectfully requested.

**Claims 14 and 16** were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhattacharya in view of Lucovsky et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,223,207 (hereafter Lucovsky).

So far as **Claims 14 and 16** depend from amended Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons listed above. In light of the above remarks, withdrawal of the rejections of each of these claims is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: October 25, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

John W. Branch

Registration No.: 41,633

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(206) 262-8900 • (212) 527-7701 fax

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant